

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

### **I. Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-20 are pending in the above-referenced case.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-15 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hoeg *et al.* U.S. Patent No. 6,371,909 (hereinafter, "Hoeg"). Claims 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Thompson *et al.* U.S. Patent No. 6,398,725 (hereinafter, "Thompson"). Claims 1-3 and 16 were rejected on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 and 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,638,216 in view of Mizuno *et al.* U.S. Patent No. 5,876,325 (hereinafter, "Mizuno").

### **II. Summary of Applicant's Reply**

Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been introduced into the subject application. Specifically, the amendments to the claims are supported by the original specification and drawings, for example, as disclosed in page 6, lines 9-20, of the application. Further, Applicant has withdrawn claim 16. The Examiner's rejection of claims 1-20 is respectfully traversed.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

**III. The Rejection of Claims 1-15 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-15 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hoeg. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 17, as amended, are allowable over Hoeg.

The Examiner allowed claim 16 except for a rejection on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting. Claim 16 has been withdrawn and claims 1 and 17 have been amended by incorporating the limitation of claim 16. Claim 1, as amended incorporating, recites: "wherein the input lens has a first angular change between a first viewing position and a second viewing position and the mirror has a second angular change between the first viewing position and the second viewing position, and the second angular change is half the first angular change." Similarly, claim 17, as amended, recites: "wherein the input lens has a first angular change between a first viewing position and a second viewing position and the CCD has a second angular change between the first viewing position and the second viewing position, and the second angular change is half the first angular change."

Applicant also respectfully submits that claims 2-15 and 18-20, each of which depends on one of independent claims 1 and 17, are allowable for at least the same reasons that the independent claims are allowable.

**IV. The Rejection of Claims 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

The Examiner rejected claims 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Thompson. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17 is allowable over Thompson.

As stated in section III, the Examiner allowed claim 16 except for a rejection on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting. Applicant has withdrawn claim 16 and amended claim 17 by incorporating the limitations of claim 16. Claim 17, as amended, recites: "wherein the input lens has a first angular change between a first viewing position and a second viewing position and the CCD has a second angular change between the first viewing position and the second viewing position, and the second angular change is half the first angular change."

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 18-20, each of which depends on independent claim 17, are allowable for at least the same reasons that the independent claim is allowable.

**V. The Rejection of Claims 1-3 and 16 under Nonstatutory Obviousness-Type Double Patenting**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 16 on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 and 5 of U.S. Patent 6,638,216 in view of Mizuno. Applicant will file a Terminal Disclaimer resolving the nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection upon the indication of allowable subject matter.

Applicant respectfully submits that, as described above, the cited prior art does not show or suggest the combination of features recited in the claims. Applicant does not concede that the cited prior art shows any of the elements recited in the claims. However, Applicant has provided specific examples of elements in the claims that are clearly not present in the cited prior art.

**AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required for this Amendment, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0219.

In the event that an Extension of Time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an Extension of Time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that Extension of Time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an Extension of Time or credit any overpayment for an Extension of Time to Deposit Account No. 08-0219.

Respectfully submitted,

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP



Gary A. Walpert  
Registration No. 26,098  
Attorney for Applicant

399 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10022  
TEL (212) 230-8800  
FAX (212) 230-8888

Date: 9/14/2006

GAW/DRW